

A neutrino mass matrix with seesaw mechanism and two-loop mass splitting

W. Grimus

Universität Wien, Institut für Theoretische Physik
Boltzmanngasse 5, A-1090 Wien, Austria

L. Lavoura

Universidade Técnica de Lisboa
Centro de Física das Interações Fundamentais
Instituto Superior Técnico, 1049-001 Lisboa, Portugal

3 July 2000

Abstract

We propose a model which uses the seesaw mechanism and the lepton number $\bar{L} = L_e - L_\mu - L_\tau$ to achieve the neutrino mass spectrum $m_1 = m_2$ and $m_3 = 0$, together with a lepton mixing matrix U with $U_{e3} = 0$. In this way, we accommodate atmospheric neutrino oscillations. A small mass splitting $m_1 > m_2$ is generated by breaking $\bar{L}$ spontaneously and using Babu's two-loop mechanism. This allows us to incorporate "just so" solar-neutrino oscillations with maximal mixing into the model. The resulting mass matrix has three parameters only, since $\bar{L}$ breaking leads exclusively to a non-zero ee matrix element.

The recent results of Super-Kamiokande [1], providing evidence for atmospheric neutrino oscillations, have lead to increased efforts [2] to investigate mechanisms for the generation of neutrino masses and mixings. In this context one wants to solve two questions:

1. Why are the neutrino masses so much smaller than the charged-lepton masses?
2. How can the specific features of the neutrino mass spectrum and of the lepton mixing matrix [3], needed to reproduce the atmospheric and solar-neutrino deficits, be generated within a model?

Proposals to answer the first question are given by the seesaw mechanism [4] and by radiative neutrino-mass generation. If we confine ourselves to extensions of the Standard Model in the Higgs sector [5], then purely radiative neutrino masses are obtained within the models of Zee [6, 7] and of Babu [8], and extended versions thereof [9, 10, 11]. As for the second question, one prominent feature of the mixing matrix U is the smallness of U_{e3} [12, 13], for which one would like to find an explanation in a model. As a means to achieve this, the lepton number $\bar{L} = L_e - L_\mu - L_\tau$ has been suggested [14].

In this letter we propose a model which combines the seesaw mechanism, Babu's radiative two-loop mechanism, and the lepton number $\bar{L}$. In this way, we have an explanation for the smallness of the neutrino masses. The seesaw mechanism will enable us to fit the atmospheric neutrino oscillations, whereas Babu's mechanism will generate the small mass-squared difference necessary for solar-neutrino oscillations. The lepton number $\bar{L}$ will insure $U_{e3} = 0$. However, the breaking of this lepton number is crucial for solar-neutrino oscillations.

Our model is given by the Standard Model of electroweak interactions, based on the gauge group $SU(2) \times U(1)$, with three Higgs doublets $\phi_k = (\varphi_k^+, \varphi_k^0)^T$, where $k = 1, 2, 3$. The vacuum expectation values of $\sqrt{2}\varphi_k^0$ are denoted v_k . We also introduce two neutrino singlets ν_{Rj} ($j = 1, 2$) and the scalar singlets f^+ , h^{++} , and η . The latter scalar is complex but has zero electric charge. We have the following assignments of the lepton number $\bar{L}$ to these multiplets:

$$\bar{L} \left| \begin{array}{cccccccccccc} \nu_e, e & \nu_\mu, \mu & \nu_\tau, \tau & \nu_{R1} & \nu_{R2} & \phi_1 & \phi_2 & \phi_3 & f^+ & h^{++} & \eta \end{array} \right. \begin{array}{cccccccccccc} 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & -2 \end{array}. \quad (1)$$

Furthermore, we need a discrete symmetry S defined by

$$S: \ell_R \rightarrow i\ell_R \quad (\ell = e, \mu, \tau), \quad \phi_2 \rightarrow -i\phi_2, \quad \phi_3 \rightarrow -\phi_3, \quad h^{++} \rightarrow -h^{++}, \quad \eta \rightarrow -\eta, \quad (2)$$

while all other multiplets, in particular the left-handed lepton doublets, transform trivially under S . With Eqs. (1) and (2) we obtain the Yukawa Lagrangian

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_Y = & -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{v_2} \sum_{\ell=e,\mu,\tau} m_\ell (\bar{\nu}_{\ell L}, \bar{\ell}_L) \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_2^+ \\ \varphi_2^0 \end{pmatrix} \ell_R \\ & -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{v_1^*} \left[\delta_e^* (\bar{\nu}_{eL}, \bar{e}_L) \nu_{R1} + \delta_\mu^* (\bar{\nu}_{\mu L}, \bar{\mu}_L) \nu_{R2} + \delta_\tau^* (\bar{\nu}_{\tau L}, \bar{\tau}_L) \nu_{R2} \right] \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_1^{0*} \\ -\varphi_1^- \end{pmatrix} \\ & + f^+ \left[f_\mu \left(\nu_{eL}^T C^{-1} \mu_L - e_L^T C^{-1} \nu_{\mu L} \right) + f_\tau \left(\nu_{eL}^T C^{-1} \tau_L - e_L^T C^{-1} \nu_{\tau L} \right) \right] \\ & + \sum_{\ell, \ell'=e,\mu,\tau} h_{\ell\ell'} \ell_R^T C^{-1} \ell'_R h^{++} + \text{H.c.}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where δ_α ($\alpha = e, \mu, \tau$), f_μ , f_τ , and the $h_{\ell\ell'}$ are complex coupling constants. The Yukawa Lagrangian in Eq. (3) is the most general one built out of the multiplets in our model and compatible with the gauge symmetry and with the symmetries $\bar{L}$ and S . The first line of Eq. (3) displays the ordinary Yukawa couplings to the Higgs doublet ϕ_2 , which give mass to the charged leptons. Notice that we have taken, without loss of generality, those Yukawa

couplings to be flavor-diagonal. The second line of Eq. (3) shows the Yukawa couplings of the right-handed neutrino singlets to ϕ_1 ; the third and fourth line display the Yukawa couplings needed to implement radiative neutrino masses using Babu's mechanism [8]. Notice that the symmetry S forbids the couplings $\nu_{R1}^T C^{-1} \nu_{R1} \eta$ and $\nu_{R2}^T C^{-1} \nu_{R2} \eta^*$, which would be allowed by $\bar{L}$.

Since the right-handed neutrino fields are gauge singlets, we can write down the mass term

$$\mathcal{L}_M = M^* \nu_{R1}^T C^{-1} \nu_{R2} + \text{H.c.}, \quad (4)$$

which is compatible with the lepton number $\bar{L}$. In the following, M will play the role of a large seesaw scale.

The neutral complex scalar η breaks the lepton number $\bar{L}$ spontaneously through its vacuum expectation value $\langle \eta \rangle_0$. In this way, the only term in the Higgs potential which is linear in η ,

$$V_\eta = \lambda \eta f^- f^- h^{++} + \text{H.c.}, \quad (5)$$

where λ is a dimensionless coupling constant, transforms upon spontaneous symmetry breaking into

$$V_{\text{sb}} = \lambda \langle \eta \rangle_0 f^- f^- h^{++} + \text{H.c.} \quad (6)$$

V_{sb} provides the trilinear scalar coupling required by Babu's mechanism [8]. Note that one cannot introduce *a priori* the $\bar{L}$ -soft-breaking term $f^- f^- h^{++}$, since this term has dimension 3 and then we would also have to introduce the mass terms $\nu_{Rj}^T C^{-1} \nu_{Rj}$ ($j = 1, 2$), which also break $\bar{L}$ softly and have dimension 3; else we would not have a technically natural model [15]. These mass terms would destroy the $\bar{L}$ invariance of the light-neutrino mass matrix already at tree level.

The symmetry S necessitates the introduction of two Higgs doublets in order to have enough freedom to make the charged leptons massive. The Higgs doublet ϕ_3 does not couple to the leptons due to the symmetry S , but it is needed in order to have the terms $(\phi_1^\dagger \phi_3)^2$ and $(\phi_1^\dagger \phi_2)(\phi_3^\dagger \phi_2)$ in the Higgs potential. These terms prevent the appearance of a Goldstone boson which would couple directly to the leptons. On the other hand, the spontaneous breaking of $\bar{L}$ results in a Majoron, given, if we assume that $\langle \eta \rangle_0$ is real, by $\sqrt{2} \text{Im } \eta$. However, this Majoron is only very weakly coupled to matter (electrons, up quarks, and down quarks) via loop diagrams [16].

Notice that, due to the specific form of the symmetry S , there are no couplings of the type $f^- \phi_k^T \tau_2 \phi_{k'}$, where τ_2 is the antisymmetric Pauli matrix and therefore $k \neq k'$. The absence of these couplings impedes Zee's mechanism for one-loop neutrino masses [6], contrary to what happens in other models [9].

Let us now discuss the neutrino mass matrix. We have a 5×5 Majorana mass matrix $\mathcal{M}$ following the five chiral neutrino fields in our model. The neutrino mass term is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{D+M}} = \frac{1}{2} \Omega_L^T C^{-1} \mathcal{M} \Omega_L + \text{H.c.}, \quad \text{with} \quad \Omega_L = (\nu_{eL}, \nu_{\mu L}, \nu_{\tau L}, (\nu_{R1})^c, (\nu_{R2})^c)^T. \quad (7)$$

The mass matrix has the decomposition

$$\mathcal{M} = \begin{pmatrix} M_L & M_D^T \\ M_D & M_R \end{pmatrix}, \quad (8)$$

with, at tree level,

$$M_D = \begin{pmatrix} \delta_e & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \delta_\mu & \delta_\tau \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad M_R = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & M \\ M & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (9)$$

according to the second line of Eq. (3) and to Eq. (4). The matrix M_L vanishes at tree level. Thus, at tree level we have [17] two degenerate neutrinos with large masses, two degenerate neutrinos which are light due to the seesaw mechanism, and one massless Weyl neutrino. But, since the lepton number $\bar{L}$ is broken by V_{sb} in Eq. (6), $M_L \neq 0$ is generated at two loops by Babu's mechanism. However, as $\bar{L}$ is operative in the Yukawa couplings of f^+ and of h^{++} , one finds that only $(M_L)_{ee}$ is non-zero. We obtain

$$M_L = \begin{pmatrix} m_{ee} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{with} \quad m_{ee} = -\frac{2\lambda\langle\eta\rangle_0}{(16\pi^2)^2} \sum_{\ell,\ell'=\mu,\tau} f_\ell h_{\ell\ell'} f_{\ell'} m_\ell m_{\ell'} I_{\ell\ell'}. \quad (10)$$

Here, $I_{\ell\ell'}$ is a convergent two-loop integral. Assuming that the masses of f^+ and of h^{++} are of the same order of magnitude and are much larger than the masses of the charged leptons, one finds [8, 10] $I_{\ell\ell'} \sim 1/m_h^2$, since all (di-)logarithms are of order 1.

We may now apply the seesaw formula in order to obtain the neutrino Majorana mass term for the light neutrinos as

$$\mathcal{L}_m = \frac{1}{2} \omega_L^T C^{-1} M_\nu \omega_L + \text{H.c.}, \quad \text{with} \quad \omega_L = (\nu_{eL}, \nu_{\mu L}, \nu_{\tau L})^T, \quad (11)$$

where

$$M_\nu = M_L - M_D^T M_R^{-1} M_D. \quad (12)$$

Inserting the expressions for M_L , M_D , and M_R into Eq. (12), we arrive at

$$M_\nu = \begin{pmatrix} m_{ee} & -\delta_e \delta_\mu / M & -\delta_e \delta_\tau / M \\ -\delta_e \delta_\mu / M & 0 & 0 \\ -\delta_e \delta_\tau / M & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (13)$$

Obviously, the second term on the right-hand side of Eq. (12), *i.e.*, Eq. (13) with $m_{ee} = 0$, is invariant under the lepton number $\bar{L}$.

By phase transformations, all elements of the mass matrix in Eq. (13) can be made real and non-negative. Consequently, there is no CP violation associated with this neutrino mass matrix. The matrix is exceedingly simple, since it is parametrized by only three positive quantities a , r , and b :¹

$$M'_\nu = \begin{pmatrix} a & rb & b \\ rb & 0 & 0 \\ b & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (14)$$

¹As a matter of fact, the mass matrix in Eq. (14) is the one implicitly suggested by Joshipura and Rindani [9] at the end of their paper. However, these authors relied on Zee's mechanism instead of relying on the seesaw mechanism, and consequently they ran into difficulties with the orders of magnitude of the various terms needed in order to fit both the atmospheric and the solar-neutrino oscillations. They have, therefore, discarded it.

The eigenvalues of M'_ν , expressed as neutrino masses, are m_1 , $-m_2$, and $m_3 = 0$, with

$$m_1 = \sqrt{m_0^2 + \frac{a^2}{4}} + \frac{a}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad m_2 = \sqrt{m_0^2 + \frac{a^2}{4}} - \frac{a}{2}, \quad (15)$$

where we have defined

$$m_0 \equiv b\sqrt{X}, \quad \text{with} \quad X \equiv 1 + r^2. \quad (16)$$

Furthermore, from M'_ν we derive the lepton mixing matrix

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} c & -is & 0 \\ \frac{r}{\sqrt{X}}s & i\frac{r}{\sqrt{X}}c & \frac{1}{\sqrt{X}} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{X}}s & i\frac{1}{\sqrt{X}}c & -\frac{r}{\sqrt{X}} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{with} \quad c \equiv \cos \theta_\odot, \quad s \equiv \sin \theta_\odot, \quad (17)$$

where $\theta_\odot$ is the solar-neutrino mixing angle. Notice that $U_{e3} = 0$. This is an important and exact prediction of our model.

Since the matrix element a in M'_ν is meant to generate a small mass splitting between m_1 and m_2 , necessary in order to accommodate solar-neutrino oscillations, this element must be tiny. Therefore, using the neutrino masses in Eq. (15) together with $m_3 = 0$, we find

$$\Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2 \simeq m_0^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta m_\odot^2 \simeq 2m_0a \quad (18)$$

for the atmospheric and solar mass-squared differences, respectively. This in turn gives

$$a \simeq \frac{\Delta m_\odot^2}{2\sqrt{\Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2}} \quad \text{and} \quad \sin^2 2\theta_\odot \simeq 1 - \frac{1}{16} \left(\frac{\Delta m_\odot^2}{\Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2} \right)^2. \quad (19)$$

As a consequence, the solar-neutrino mixing angle is for all practical purposes 45° , and a fit to the solar-neutrino data requires the “just so” or vacuum-oscillation (VO) solution to the solar-neutrino deficit (for recent analyses see Refs. [18, 19, 20, 21]). The so-called LOW solution [18, 21, 22] might also be allowed [23]. In the following we shall however concentrate on the VO solution. Due to $U_{e3} = 0$, solar-neutrino oscillations are decoupled from the atmospheric oscillation parameters [24]. The mixing angle for atmospheric neutrino oscillations is obtained from the mixing matrix in Eq. (17) as

$$\sin^2 2\theta_{\text{atm}} = \frac{4r^2}{(1 + r^2)^2}. \quad (20)$$

According to the Super-Kamiokande results [25], $\sin^2 2\theta_{\text{atm}} \gtrsim 0.88$ at 90% CL, and one therefore has the range

$$0.7 \lesssim r \lesssim 1.4 \quad (21)$$

for the parameter r . We then have a scenario very close to bimaximal mixing [26].

Thus, with Eqs. (19), (21), and

$$b \simeq \sqrt{\frac{\Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2}{1 + r^2}}, \quad (22)$$

all three parameters of M'_ν are in principle determined by the atmospheric and solar-neutrino oscillation data. Summarizing, with $\Delta m_\odot^2 \sim 10^{-10} \text{ eV}^2$, $\Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2 \sim 3.2 \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2$ [25], and the atmospheric neutrino mixing angle close to 45° , we arrive at the order-of-magnitude estimates

$$a \sim 10^{-9} \text{ eV}, \quad b \sim 0.04 \text{ eV}, \quad r \sim 1. \quad (23)$$

We now want to study how to implement these estimates in our model. To this end it is useful to consider the different mass scales present in the model. Apart from the electroweak scale, and with the following simplifying assumptions, we have three scales:

- The scale, denoted m_D , of δ_e , δ_μ , and δ_τ — assuming that these parameters are all of the same order of magnitude.²
- The mass scale of the new scalars, where we make the reasonable assumption $m_h \sim m_f \sim \langle \eta \rangle_0$.
- The mass M of the right-handed neutrino singlets.

Obviously, the two mass-squared differences Δm_{atm}^2 and $\Delta m_\odot^2$ cannot determine all three mass scales. However, the two-loop expression in Eq. (10) results in

$$a \sim \frac{1}{(16\pi^2)^2} \left| \lambda f_\tau^2 h_{\tau\tau} \right| \frac{m_\tau^2}{m_h}, \quad (24)$$

where we have assumed that all the couplings $h_{\ell\ell'}$ are of similar magnitude (and also $|f_\mu| \approx |f_\tau|$) and that, therefore, the two- τ contribution to Babu's two-loop diagram is dominant. Equation (24) allows us to estimate the mass scale of the Higgs scalars:

$$m_h \sim \left| \lambda f_\tau^2 h_{\tau\tau} \right| \times 10^{14} \text{ GeV}. \quad (25)$$

With the dimensionless coupling constants λ , f_τ , and $h_{\tau\tau}$ being at most of order 1, we may consider 10^{14} GeV as an upper bound for m_h . Clearly, with the scalar singlets having such large masses, there are no restrictions on their Yukawa interactions stemming from decays and scattering data.

From the atmospheric mass-squared difference we get

$$\left| \frac{m_D^2}{M} \right| \sim \sqrt{\Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2} \sim 0.06 \text{ eV}. \quad (26)$$

We can tentatively fix m_D by making the assumption that it is of the order of m_τ , the largest of the charged-lepton masses. This leads to $M \sim 10^{11} \text{ GeV}$. Interestingly, this order of magnitude is compatible with m_h — see Eq. (25) — if we assume that the dimensionless coupling constants are $\sim 10^{-1}$. An attractive option would be to identify the two mass scales, *i.e.*, to assume $M \sim m_h$.

To summarize, in this paper we have advocated the three-parameter neutrino mass matrix in Eq. (14). That mass matrix yields maximal solar-neutrino mixing and, therefore, it requires the vacuum-oscillation solution to the solar-neutrino deficit (the LOW

² δ_μ and δ_τ certainly are of similar magnitude, as follows from Eqs. (13), (14), and (21).

solution might also be an option). On the other hand, in order to obtain nearly maximal atmospheric neutrino mixing one has to tune the parameter r to be close to 1. With this mass matrix one gets the neutrino mass spectrum $m_1 \simeq m_2$ and $m_3 = 0$, while $U_{e3} = 0$ in the lepton mixing matrix of Eq. (17). Notice that $m_3 = 0$, the inverted mass hierarchy, and $U_{e3} = 0$ are exact, testable predictions. We have furthermore shown that the mass matrix in Eq. (14) can be obtained in an extension of the Standard Model with a spontaneously broken lepton-number symmetry $\bar{L}$ — the ensuing Majoron couples very weakly to matter — together with a seesaw mechanism, responsible for the smallness of the mass b , and a radiative mass-generation mechanism, responsible for the tiny mass a . We have shown that it is sufficient to have a single heavy mass scale in our model, comprising both the seesaw scale and the scale associated with the masses of the new gauge-singlet scalar particles; a value of order 10^{11} GeV would be a suitable choice for this heavy mass scale. The smallness of the mass a in the mass matrix of Eq. (14) practically forbids neutrinoless $\beta\beta$ decay.

References

- [1] Super-Kamiokande Collaboration, Y. Fukuda *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 1562 (1998); **82**, 2644 (1999); Phys. Lett. B **467**, 185 (1999).
- [2] For recent reviews, see G. Altarelli and F. Feruglio, Phys. Rep. (to be published), hep-ph/9905536; S. M. Barr and I. Dorsner, hep-ph/0003058.
- [3] For recent reviews, see K. Zuber, Phys. Rep. **305**, 295 (1998); S. M. Bilenky, C. Giunti, and W. Grimus, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **43**, 1 (1999); P. Fisher, B. Kayser, and K. S. McFarland, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **49**, edited by C. Quigg, V. Luth, and P. Paul (Annual Reviews, Palo Alto, California, 1999), p. 481; V. Barger, hep-ph/0003212.
- [4] M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond, and R. Slansky, in *Supergravity*, edited by D. Z. Freedman and F. van Nieuwenhuizen (North Holland, Amsterdam, 1979); T. Yanagida, in *Proceedings of the workshop on unified theory and baryon number in the universe*, edited by O. Sawata and A. Sugamoto (KEK, Tsukuba, Japan, 1979); R. N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanović, Phys. Rev. Lett. **44**, 912 (1980).
- [5] W. Konetschny and W. Kummer, Phys. Lett. **70B**, 433 (1977).
- [6] A. Zee, Phys. Lett. **93B**, 389 (1980); **161B**, 141 (1982).
- [7] C. Jarlskog, M. Matsuda, S. Skadhauge, and M. Tanimoto, Phys. Lett. B **449**, 240 (1999); P. H. Frampton and S. L. Glashow, *ibid.* **461**, 95 (1999).
- [8] K. S. Babu, Phys. Lett. B **203**, 132 (1988).
- [9] A. S. Joshipura and S. D. Rindani, Phys. Lett. B **464**, 239 (1999).
- [10] L. Lavoura, hep-ph/0005321.

- [11] T. Kitabayashi and M. Yasuè, hep-ph/0006014.
- [12] CHOOZ Collaboration, M. Apollonio *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **466**, 415 (1999).
- [13] O. Yasuda, Phys. Rev. D **58**, 091301 (1998); G. L. Fogli *et al.*, *ibid.* **59**, 033001 (1999); V. Barger and K. Whisnant, *ibid.* **59**, 093007 (1999).
- [14] S. T. Petcov, Phys. Lett. **110B**, 245 (1982); C. N. Leung and S. T. Petcov, *ibid.* **125B**, 461 (1983); R. Barbieri, L. J. Hall, D. Smith, A. Strumia, and N. Weiner, JHEP **9812**, 017 (1998).
- [15] G. 't Hooft, in *Recent developments in gauge theories, Cargèse 1979*, edited by G. 't Hooft *et al.* (Plenum Press, New York, 1980).
- [16] Y. Chikashige, R. N. Mohapatra, and R. D. Peccei, Phys. Lett. **98B**, 265 (1981).
- [17] G. C. Branco, W. Grimus, and L. Lavoura, Nucl. Phys. **B312**, 492 (1989).
- [18] J. N. Bahcall, P. I. Krastev, and A. Yu. Smirnov, Phys. Rev. D **58**, 096016 (1998); **60**, 093001 (1999).
- [19] V. Barger and K. Whisnant, Phys. Lett. B **456**, 54 (1999).
- [20] S. Goswami, D. Majumdar, and A. Raychaudhuri, hep-ph/9909453.
- [21] G. L. Fogli, E. Lisi, D. Montanino, and A. Palazzo, hep-ph/0005261.
- [22] M. C. Gonzalez-Garcia *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **B573**, 3 (2000).
- [23] M. C. Gonzalez-Garcia and C. Peña-Garay, hep-ph/0002186.
- [24] S. M. Bilenky and C. Giunti, Phys. Lett. B **444**, 379 (1998).
- [25] Super-Kamiokande Collaboration, H. Sobel, talk presented at Neutrino2000, June 16–21, 2000, Sudbury, Ontario, in <http://nu2000.sno.laurentian.ca/H.Sobel/>. See also N. Fornengo, M. C. Gonzalez-Garcia, and J. W. F. Valle, hep-ph/0002147.
- [26] E. Torrente-Lujan, Phys. Lett. B **389**, 557 (1996); F. Vissani, hep-ph/9708483; V. Barger, S. Pakvasa, T. J. Weiler, and K. Whisnant, Phys. Lett. B **437**, 107 (1998); M. Jezabek and Y. Sumino, *ibid.* **440**, 327 (1998); A. Baltz, A. S. Goldhaber, and M. Goldhaber, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 5730 (1998).